REMARKS

Claims 64-86 are pending in the present application. In the above amendments, claims 64, 72, 77 and 82 have been amended.

Applicants respectfully respond to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 64-69, 71-75, 77-80 and 82-85 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0141591 to Hawkes et al. (the Hawkes application publication) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0168446 to Ahonen et al. (the Ahonen application publication). Claims 70, 76, 81 and 86 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over the Hawkes application publication in view of the Ahonen application publication, and further in view of Applied Cryptography, Second Edition by Bruce Schneier (the Schneier publication).

The rejection of claim 64 as allegedly unpatentable over the Hawkes application publication in view of the Ahonen application publication is respectfully traversed. Claim 64, as amended, recites a method for broadcasting encrypted multimedia content from a content provider to a plurality of authorized terminals over the air, comprising: each terminal forwarding a unique public key over the air to the content provider, wherein each terminal has a mobile equipment and has a secure processing unit that securely stores a unique private key, corresponding to the unique public key, such that the unique private key is not accessible to the mobile equipment of the respective terminal user, the secure processing unit provides more secure key storage than the mobile equipment, the secure processing unit has processing power sufficient to decrypt a broadcast access key and to generate a short term key, the secure processing unit does not have processing power sufficient to decrypt multimedia content, and the broadcast access key is encrypted by the content provider using the unique public keys of each of the respective terminals to authorize the respective terminal to receive encrypted multimedia content. Support for the amendments to claim 64 may be located in the original specification at page 11, lines 17-24, and page 12, lines 6-14.

Applicants assert that the Hawkes publication and the Ahonen publication fail to show a secure processing unit that securely stores a unique private key such that the unique private key is not accessible to the mobile equipment, where the secure processing unit provides more secure key storage than the mobile equipment, and where the secure processing unit has processing power sufficient to decrypt a broadcast access key and to generate a short term key, and does not have processing power sufficient to decrypt multimedia content.

The Examiner indicates that the Hawkes publication "lacks each terminals forwarding a unique public key over the air to the content provider and lacks wherein the secure processing unit stores a unique private key (instead of Hawkes's RK), corresponding to the unique public key." See, Office Action, page 5, lines 13-15. The Examiner further observes that the Ahonen publication teaches "each terminal stores a private key corresponding to the unique public key (terminal creates a signature using the private key, ¶38 & ¶42, showing that the terminal stores the private key)." See, Office Action, page 5, lines 17-19.

Applicants assert that the Ahonen publication fails to remedy the disclosure deficiencies of the Hawkes publication. The Ahonen publication merely discloses use of the private key without disclosing secure storage of the private key in a secure processing unit that provides more secure key storage than the mobile equipment, and that does not have processing power sufficient to decrypt multimedia content.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 64 recites patentable advances over the Hawkes application publication in view of the Ahonen application, and respectfully request the rejections of claim 64 be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 65-69 and 71 are at least allowable for the reasons given above in relation to independent claim 64.

Claims 72-75, 77-80 and 82-85 are integrated circuit, machine readable medium, and apparatus claims having features defined by language similar to that of method claims 64-69 and 71. Accordingly, for the reasons recited above with respect to claims 64-69 and 71, claims 72-75, 77-80 and 82-85 define patentable advances over the Hawkes application publication in view of the Ahonen application, and the rejections of claims 72-75, 77-80 and 82-85 should be withdrawn.

The rejections of claims 70, 76, 81 and 86 as being unpatentable over the Hawkes application publication in view of the Ahonen application publication, and further in view of the Schneier publication, are respectfully traversed. Claims 70, 76, 81 and 86 incorporate all of the features of independent claims 64, 72, 77 and 82, respectively. Applicants assert that the Schneier publication fails to remedy the disclosure deficiencies of the Hawkes and Ahonen patent publications as described above with respect to claim 64. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 70, 76, 81 and 86.

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: **January 7, 2010**

By: _____
Won Tae C. Kim, Reg. # 40,457
(858) 651 - 6295

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502